



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 08/697,542 | 08/27/1996 | ROBERT S. BLOCK | 003750-006 | 9969 |
| 21839 | 7590 09/14/20 | 06 | EXAMINER | |
| BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC | | | BELIVEAU, SCOTT E | |
| | CE BOX 1404 RIA, VA 22313-140 | 4 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | , | | 2623 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 09/14/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| , à | | Application No. | n No. Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 08/697,542 | BLOCK, ROBERT S. | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | Scott Beliveau | 2623 | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 Se | eptember 2006. | | | | |
| | | action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowar | nce except for formal matters, pro | esecution as to the merits is | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Dispositi | ion of Claims | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>25,27,31,47 and 61-66</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)□ | 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8)⊠ | 8) Claim(s) 25,27,31,47 and 61-66 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | |
| 9)[| The specification is objected to by the Examiner | r. | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority u | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice | 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. | | | | | |
| 3) 🗶 Inforn | B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application | | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> | | | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Miscellaneous

1. Please note that the examiner and art unit of record for this application has changed.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05 September 2006 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. With respect to applicant's remarks concerning the IDS statements submitted June 18, 1999, July 14, 99, and August 31, 1999 having not been previously considered, it is noted that according to the Office records initialed copies of the IDS statements were mailed to applicants on least 10 July 2002. Copies of the aforementioned previously provided and considered statements are attached.

Election/Restrictions

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 27 and 31, drawn to a method and apparatus for forming a local information label, classified in class 725, subclass 28.

- II. Claims 34, 45, 47, 61-66, drawn to a system and method for scheduling of advertisements during a program, classified in class 725, subclass 34.
- 5. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination (Group II) merely broadly recites the particular usage of 'information labels' in association with the particular scheduling of targeted advertisements. The combination does not require any of the particular with respect to the particular formation of the 'information labels' as recited in Group I. The subcombination (Group I) has separate utility such as the particular ability to modify 'information labels' and to further utilize the established information conjunction with parental control functionality unrelated to the scheduling of advertisements.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a

continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

- 6. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 7. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 8. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 9. This application further contains claims corresponding to Group II that are directed to patentably distinct species pertaining to the scheduling of advertisements either 'within a predetermined time interval' (Claims 34, 45, 47, 61, and 62) or 'outside a predetermined time interval' (Claims 63-66). The species are independent or distinct because as further noted in applicant's pre-appeal brief (26 June 2006), the particular scheduling of advertisements either 'either within' or 'outside a predetermined interval' requires for the particular finding of two

entirely opposite claim limitations and as argued in the pre-appeal brief should be considered to be separately patentable.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are considered generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

10. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species and/or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 571-272-7343. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 08/697,542

Art Unit: 2623

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access

to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or

access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or

571-272-1000.

Scott Beliveau Primary Examiner Art Unit 2623

ABIL:

September 11, 2006

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: Copies of initialized IDS statements mailed 10 July 2002.